

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-27 were rejected. By this paper, Applicants have canceled claims 26-27 and have amended claims 1, 5, and 25. These amendments do not add any new matter and support for the amendments may be found at least on page 13, lines 14-20, page 16, lines 19-21, page 17, lines 5-7, page 18, lines 5-8, and page 18, line 18 - page 19, line 7 of the originally filed specification. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 1-25 remain pending in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on August 18, 2009. Applicants discussed the amendments to independent claims 16 and 19 made in the Response to Office Action mailed March 23, 2009 as well as the prior art cited in the rejection of independent claims 16 and 19 in the Final Office Action of June 10, 2009. It was agreed that independent claims 16 and 19, as well as all claims depending therefrom, were not obvious in view of the prior art of record. Moreover, it was agreed that arguments similar to those presented during the interview would be made in this response. Also discussed was the Section 101 rejection of independent claim 25, as well as potential amendments of independent claim 25 to overcome the Section 101 rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Final Office Action, claims 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Section 101 rejection, to further prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 25 as discussed during the interview on August 18, 2009. At least in view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 101 rejection of independent claim 25 is obviated. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Neuberger et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0153322 (hereinafter “Neuberger”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections since the cited references fails to anticipate each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

Omitted Features of Independent Claims 1 and 5

Neuberger fails to anticipate each element of independent claims 1 and 5. Independent claim 1 recites, in part, “A signal processor...configured to access the respective application at the entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of applications upon receipt of the token.” (Emphasis added.) Similarly, independent claim 5 recites, in part, “a browser module configured to acquire the token and to access an entry point for one of a plurality of applications based upon the token directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of applications.” (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, each of amended independent claims 1 and 5 recite a device configured to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of applications. That is, for example, a constituent of the composite grammar may be utilized to directly access a specific level of a menu hierarchy across a plurality of various applications. *See* specification, page 16, lines 12-17 and page 18, lines 5-10.

The Final Office Action specifically concedes that Neuberger fails to disclose an entry point “accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy.” *See* Final Office Action, page 10. Indeed, Neuberger appears to describe a system that, at best, appears to allow a user to preemptively respond to a subsequent prompt of a single application before the prompt is delivered. *See* Neuberger, paragraph 11. That is, for a given single application, a user may transition not just to the next state, but to a subsequent state of that same application along a given path. *See id.*, paragraph 14. For example, as seen in FIG. 3 of Neuberger, a user may enter an application to adjust the settings of a system (ref. 114). From this point in the “settings” application (at point 114 of FIG. 3), a user may, for example, access either the passcode 140 or notification 142 user response without waiting for a prompt. That is, a user

may transition to a subsequent state of a single application preemptively. However, any navigation through a given application, i.e. either a message application, a settings application, or a greetings application, is performed within that application. That is, Neuberger does not describe accessing other applications from inside of a single application (i.e. accessing an application directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of applications, as recited in independent claims 1 and 5).

Therefore, Neuberger fails to disclose all elements of independent claims 1 and 5, and, thus, cannot anticipate the claims under Section 102. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of independent claims 1 and 5, as well as all claims depending therefrom.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, claims 16-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Neuberger, in view of Haenel et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,401,024 (hereinafter “Haenel”); claim 2 was rejected over Neuberger in view of Busayapongchai et al., U.S. Patent 6,944,594 (hereinafter “Busayapongchai”); claims 6, 9 and 10 was rejected over Neuberger, in view of Denenberg et al., U.S. Patent 7,158,936 (hereinafter “Denenberg”); and claims 26 and 27 were rejected over Neuberger in view of Haenel and further in view of Dressler et al., *COTS SAR Processing Software*, (hereinafter “Dressler”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections since the cited references fails to teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

Omitted Features of claims 16, 19, 24, and 25

Neuberger and Haenel, taken alone or in hypothetical combination, fail to teach each element of independent claims 16, 19, 24, and 25. Independent claim 16 recites, in part, accessing an entry point in second processing hardware of one of the plurality of applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar, wherein the entry point is accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of applications.” (Emphasis added.) Similarly, independent claim 19 recites, in part, “programming instructions stored on

the computer-readable medium for accessing an entry point of one of the plurality of applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar, wherein the entry point is accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of applications.” (Emphasis added.) Independent claim 24 recites, in part, “storing programming instructions for accessing an entry point of one of the plurality of applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar on the computer-readable medium, wherein the entry point is accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of applications.” (Emphasis added.) Finally, independent claim 25 recites, in part, a “encoding at least one signal processing device with code programmed to...access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of one of a plurality of applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar.” (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, each of independent claims 16, 19, and 24 recite an ability to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of applications. Similarly, independent claim 25 recites code programmed to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of one of a plurality of applications. The Final Office Action specifically concedes that Neuberger fails to disclose an entry point “accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy.” *See* Final Office Action, page 10. The Final Office Action attempts to remedy this deficiency by applying the teachings of Haenel. Applicants respectfully submit that, Neuberger and Haenel fail to teach all elements recited in independent claims 16, 19, 24, and 25.

As noted in the Final Office Action (*see* Final Office Action, page 10), Haenel teaches a menu hierarchy that may be flattened into a single layer for access to a particular node. *See* Haenel, col. 4, lines 23-40 (emphasis added). However, because of the system collapses a hierarchy into a single layer, the layer is no longer a menu hierarchy, e.g. a tree-like structure with higher and lower levels. *See* Haenel, col. 3, lines 20-24. Therefore, Haenel cannot be read as teaching accessing a level of a menu hierarchy. Moreover, because accessing a single layer, as disclosed in Haenel, does not teach accessing a level of a menu hierarchy, Haenel cannot be read as teaching accessing an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy, as

recited in independent claims 16, 19, and 24 or as teaching code programmed to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of one of a plurality of applications, as recited in independent claim 25. As such, Haenel fails to obviate the admitted deficiencies of Neuberger with respect to accessing an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of applications and code programmed to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of one of a plurality of applications, as set forth in independent claims 16, 19, 24, and 25, respectively.

Furthermore, the cited portions of Busayapongchai, Denenberg, and Dressler do not appear to teach accessing an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy, as recited in independent claims 16, 19, and 24 or as teaching code programmed to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of one of a plurality of applications, as recited in independent claims 25.

Therefore, because none of the cited references, taken alone or in hypothetical combination, teach all of the elements of independent claims 16, 19, 24, and 25, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of independent claims 16, 19, 24, and 25, as well as all claims depending therefrom.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 10, 2009

/Matthew C. Dooley/
Matthew C. Dooley
Reg. No. 61,996
FLETCHER YODER
7915 FM 1960 West, Suite 330
Houston, TX 77070
(281) 970-4545